

## **REMARKS**

In response to the Official Action mailed February 6, 2003, the Applicants, through their attorney, reply as follows. A restriction requirement was issued in the Office Action. The Examiner required election of the claims of either Group I (claims 9-17), or Group II (claims 1-8). The Applicants hereby elect the claims of Group II (claims 1-8) with traverse.

The Applicants maintain that the restriction requirement issued is improper. The Examiner stated that in this case, the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product such as goggles incorporating liquid crystal. However, claim 1 recites a liquid crystal display only in the preamble of the claim. Because the preamble merely states the purpose or intended use of this invention, the recitation of a liquid crystal cell should not be considered a limitation of claim 1 or any of the claims that depend from it that do not specifically recite the presence of the optical compensation film in a liquid crystal display. The goggles suggested by the Examiner would contain an optical compensation film as recited in claim 1. It should also be noted that such goggles made according to this process, as suggested by the Examiner, would necessarily incorporate the elements recited in the method claims, such as electrodes disposed on a substrate or on an optical compensation film. Therefore, goggles or other articles manufactured according to this method would necessarily be classified as liquid crystal displays having an optical compensation film as recited in claims 1-8. Therefore, the Applicants maintain that the inventions of Groups I and II are not distinct and the present restriction requirement is improper.

Amendments are also offered for the sole purpose of clarifying the specification. The amendment offered to the paragraph beginning on page 5, line 11 inserts a missing period at the end of the paragraph. The amendment to the paragraph beginning on page 7, line 24 eliminates a potential ambiguity in the description of Figure 2. The replacement paragraph beginning on page 12, line 14 corrects the spelling of the name of the author of the

Application No.: 09/722,991  
Amendment dated: March 6, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of February 6, 2003

cited reference. The replacement paragraph beginning at page 13, line 14 corrects an error in the original specification regarding the intensity of light used in Example 1. Likewise the replacement paragraph beginning at page 18, line 10 corrects an error in the original specification regarding the intensity of light used in Example 3.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the foregoing in more detail, the undersigned attorney would welcome a telephone call.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "John J. Cunniff", is written over a horizontal line.

John J. Cunniff, Reg. No. 42,451

Renner, Kenner, Greive, Bobak, Taylor & Weber

First National Tower - Fourth Floor

Akron, Ohio 44308-1456

Telephone: (330) 376-1242

Facsimile: (330) 376-9646

E-mail: jjcunniff@rennerkenner.com

Attorney for Applicants

Dated: March 6, 2003